Remarks

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed January 23, 2008 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-25, 27-29, 31-38, 40-44. Claims 1, 10, 23, 28, and 35 have been amended. Claims 4, 5, 16, 17, 26, 30, and 39 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 10-17, 23-31, and 35-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam, et al. (U.S. Patent 7,032,022) in view of Menditto, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,981,029). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Turning initially to Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> "determining if a policy template is present at an enforcement point in response to receiving an identification (ID) assigned to the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter", the policy template and the parameters being transmitted separately to reduce use of communication resources by factoring the template and parameters to be used in the template and to permit different parameters to be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template again to further reduce use of communication resources . . . "

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Shanumgam nor Menditto teach or suggest these features of Claim 1. Shanumgam in column 1 beginning at line 65 and continuing in column 2 through line 13 recites:

> "The present invention is directed to a unified policy management system where various policies, namely, the set of rules and instructions that determine the network's operation, may be established and enforced from a single site. According to one embodiment of the invention, the system includes a first edge device associated with a first network having a first set of resources that is configured to manage the policies for the first network according to the policy settings stored in the first database. The system also includes a second edge device associated with a second network having a second set of resources that is configured to manage the policies for the second network according to the policy settings stored in a second database the first and second edge device's act as policy enforcers for their respective networks."

Accordingly, Shanumgam teaches edge devices acting as policy enforcers that have resources that are configured according to policy settings stored in a database to manage policies in a network. Applicant respectfully submits that this section of Shanumgam does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in amended Claim 1 above.

Additionally, Shanumgam in column 8, lines 20-54 recites in pertinent part:

> "FIG. 5 is an exemplary flow diagram of a policy enforcer pre-registration and registration process according to one embodiment of the invention. In step 401, the policy enforcer is connected to the network and installed at its actual physical location using the above-described policy enforcer installation wizard 406. The network administrator, possessing the new device's serial number, pre-registers the policy enforcer by adding the new policy enforcer to a device group in step 403. In this regard, the configuration interface 410 invokes an interactive graphical interface, such as the one illustrated in FIG. 6, allowing the network administrator to enter a device name 415, serial number 417, and location information 419, in further allowing the administrator to select a device group 421 to which the new policy enforcer is to belong. Actuation of an applied button 423 causes the new policy enforcer, in step 405 to contact the policy server 122 by preferably invoking a URL on the policy server. Once the policy server has been contacted, the new policy enforcer transmits its registration packet to the policy server. The registration packet includes at least a serial number of the new policy enforcer, as well as the IP address of the LAN, WAN, and DMS on the policy enforcer. In step 407, the centralized management sub-module 306 compares the serial number of the new policy enforcer with the list of policy enforcers pre-registered with the policy enforced server 122. If a match is found, the policy server 122 proceeds with the registration process by packaging, in step 409, the settings selected for the policy enforcer during its installation process, preferably into an LDAP data interchange format (ldif) file. In Step 411, the file is transmitted to the policy enforcer preferably over an HTTPS channel, by invoking a common gateway interface (CGI) on the policy enforcer. The policy enforcer then uses the file to initialize it's configuration database, such as database 132, 134 in step 413."

Accordingly, Shanumgam teaches transmitting a file including settings for setting up the policy enforcer during its installation process. Applicant respectfully submits that Shanumgam does not teach or suggest transmitting parameters to be used in a policy template wherein the policy template includes a form of "if a first parameter then a second parameter" as defined in the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Amended Claim 1. Shanumgam also does not teach or suggest that the policy template and the parameters are transmitted separately and that different parameters may be transmitted from time to time to replace previous parameters in the

policy template without the need of transmitting the entire policy template as recited in amended Claim 1.

Menditto also does not teach these features of the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Amended Claim 1. In addition to the features recited above, Claim 1 also recites:

> "transmitting a query from the enforcement point to a repository, where policy templates are stored, in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point, wherein the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template;
>
> receiving the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the policy template is transmitted by the repository in response to the query; and
>
> receiving a set of parameters to be used in the policy template at the enforcement point, wherein the set of parameters are transmitted separately from the policy template."

The Office Action on page 4 indicates that these features of Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Shanumgam. Applicant respectfully submits that Menditto also does not teach or suggest these features of Claim 1 as recited above. Menditto teaches a system and method for processing a request for information in a network and Menditto does not teach or suggest policy templates and parameters as defined in the embodiment of the present invention recited in amended Claim 1. In the Abstract, column 1, lines 45-53, and Figures 1 and 3 of Menditto cited in rejecting claim 1, Menditto teach an information service provider network including a content gateway to process requests for information from a client terminal. Accordingly, Menditto teaches transmitting requests for information from a client server in an information service provider network and Menditto does not teach or suggest transmitting a query from an enforcement point to a repository where policy templates are stored in response to the policy template not being present at the enforcement point as provided by amended Claim 1. Additionally, Menditto does not teach or suggest that the query includes the ID assigned to the policy template.

Further, Menditto in column 2, lines 43-53, cited in rejecting Claim 1, describes a content gateway policy manager 26 that serves as a repository for content policies and communicates with content gateways 18 to distribute content policies within information service provider 12 and exchange policies with other content gateway policy managers in other service providers. Accordingly, Menditto teaches distributing complete content policies but does not teach or

suggest transmitting a policy template in response to a query from a enforcement point when the policy template is not present at the enforcement point. Nor does Menditto teach or suggest that a set of parameters to be used in the policy template at the enforcement point are transmitted separately to the enforcement point from the policy template as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended Claim 1.

For all of these reasons, applicant respeetfully submits that Claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over Shanumgam and Menditto, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam in view of Menditto, these claims depend either directly or indireetly from independent Claim 1. Because of this dependeney, these claims include all of the features of independent Claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also respeetfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Shanumgam and Menditto, and reeonsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of Claims 2 and 3 is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of independent Claims 10, 23, 28, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam in view of Menditto, these elaims have been amended to reeite similar features to independent Claim 1. Therefore, independent Claims 10, 23, 28, and 35 are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Shanumgam and Menditto for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 10, 23, 28, and 35 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejeetion of Claims 11-15, 24-25 and 27, 29 and 31, 36-38 and 40, Claims 11-15 depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 10; Claims 24-25 and 27 depend directly from independent Claim 23; Claims 29 and 31 depend directly from independent Claim 28; and Claims 36-38 and 40 depend either directly or indirectly from indepcndent Claim 35. Because of these dependencies, these claims include all of the features of the respective referenced independent claims and any intervening claims. Therefore, these claims are respectfully submitted to be patentably distinct over Shanumgam and Menditto for the same reasons as discussed with respect to independent Claims 10, 23, 28, and 35.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of these claims is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Claims 6, 18, 32, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam in view of Menditto and further in view of Widegren, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,621,793). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office Action on page 11 admits that Shanumgam and Menditto fail to teach the features of claims 6, 18, 32 and 41. Column 22, lines 41-53 of Widegren were cited in rejecting claims 6, 18, 32, and 41. This is dependent claim 25 of Widegren which recites:

> 25. The method of claim 21, wherein one gateway support node request for policy information from the policy control function (a pull request), upon receipt of an IP bearer resource request, may be followed by few policy control function decisions and where an asynchronous notification will allow the policy control function to notify the policy enforcement point in the gateway support node whenever necessary to change earlier decisions or generate errors, and where pull requests may be used at network bearer setup and at network bearer modification and in subsequent phases the policy decisions are pushed to the gateway support node by the policy control function.

Thus, Widegren teaches asynchronous notification to allow the policy control function to notify the enforcement point whenever necessary to change earlier decisions or generate errors, but Applicant respectfully submits that Widegren does not teach or suggest applying asynchronous, out-of-band communication to transmit the query and any policy templates as provided by the embodiment of the present invention in Claims 6, 18, 32, and 41. Additionally, Claim 6 depends directly from independent Claim 1, Claim 18 depends directly from independent Claim 10, Claim 32 depends indirectly from independent Claim 28, and Claim 41 depends indirectly from independent Claim 35. As a result of these dependencies, these claims include all of the features of the respective referenced independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Widegren adds nothing to the teachings of Shanumgam and Menditto so as to render independent Claims 1, 10, 23 and 35 unpatentable. Accordingly, for all of the reasons discussed, Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 are respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Shanumgam, Menditto and Widegren, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of Claims 6, 18, 32 and 41 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 19, 20, 33, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam in view of Menditto and in further view of Danieli (U.S. Patent 6,510,513). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 depends directly from independent Claim 1; Claims 19 and 20 depend directly from independent Claim 10; Claim 33 depends indirectly from independent Claim 28; and Claim 42 depends directly from independent Claim 35. As a result of these dependencies, these claims include all of the features of the referenced independent claim and any intervening claims. Danieli, in column 16, lines 21-35, cited in rejecting these claims, teaches that if a distribution unit is a compressed file, the client must uncompress the file. Applicant respectfully submits that Danieli adds nothing to the teachings of Shanumgam and Menditto so as to render independent Claims 1, 10, 28 and 35 unpatentable. Therefore, Claims 7, 19, 20, 33, and 42 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited documents in reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43, and 44, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanumgam, Menditto, and in further view of Valente (U.S. Patent Pub 2003/0110192). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 8 depends directly from independent Claim 21; Claim 21 depends directly from independent Claim 10; Claim 34 depends directly from independent Claim 28; and Claim 43 depends directly from independent Claim 35. Because of these dependencies, these claims include all of the features of the referenced independent claims. Valente was cited for teaching, forming each policy template in a structured document. Applicant respectfully submits that Valente adds nothing to the teachings of the other cited documents so as to render the independent claims discussed above unpatentable. Therefore, Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43 and 44 are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the documents of record in the present application, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of Claims 8, 9, 21, 22, 34, 43, and 44 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date are respectfully requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Kaminsky
(Applicant)

Date: March 26, 2008

By: Charles L. Moore

Charles L. Moore
Registration No. 33,742
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC
430 Davis Drive
Suite 500
Morrisville, N.C. 27560
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199